IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF SOUTH DAKOTA
SOUTHERN DIVISION

Rene D. Meyer plaintiff V Judge Patrick Schroeder Judge Eric Johnson MINNEHAHA COUNTY INC MINNEHAHA STATES ATTORNEYS OFFICE- Aaron McGowan STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA INC. ATTORNEY GENERAL – Marty Jackley MINNEHAHA PUBLIC DEFENDERS OFFICE Lisa Capellupo defendants	)))))))))))))))))))	CASE NO. 18-4037 JURY TRIAL DEMANDED FOR VIOLATIONS OF RICO ACT & CIVIL RIGHTS & DAMAGES FOR JOB AND INCOME LOSSES & MORE

* *

COMPLAINT

Comes now plaintiff Rene Meyer for her cause of action against the defendants, Judge Patrick Shroader, Minnehaha County Inc, Minnehaha states attorneys office, Aaron McGowan, State of South Dakota Inc. and Attorney General of South Dakota, Marty Jackley. All have conspired to take away my civil rights and are in violation of the United States Constitution, the Rico act, they took away my right to a jury trial, my right to a court appointed attorney, and my civil rights as a sovereign citizen. They do not follow proper procedure and the Constitution & do what ever they want regardless of the harm. They have failed to follow the law of contracts and have no contract to rule over me. They have damaged my name and reputation, and have been responsible for one job loss and the loss of several good job opportunities. They constantly move court dates with no notification, and have done so at least 3 times and constantly schedule me on days that I am working and have almost cost me the small job I do have. They have failed to provide court room procedures on HOW to subpoena witnesses.

JURISDICTION

The district courts have jurisdiction of all civil actions arising under the Constitution, laws or treaties of the United States. These violations fall under the RICO ACT, the Constitution, and the State of South Dakota Constitution. In amendment 7, a trial by jury in Civil cases, I have a right to a jury trial for anything over $40. I moved to Minnehaha county last may of 2017 and the Southern Division is where it has happened and where my new residence is at now.

INTRODUCTION

1. On 7/12/17 MINNEHAHA COUNTY OFFICER CAME INTO MY PLACE OF EMPLOYMENT AND HARASSED ME AND gave me a "TICKET" for selling alcohol to someone under 21. I was threatened with job loss from my manager Leslie if I did not sign the contract, i e "ticket". And was threatened by the officer with bodily harm if I did not submit to signing.

2. I immediately wrote, the affidavit of truth, and had everything including the "TICKET" notorized on 7/17/2017. Which is within the 3 business days to break any contract. The federal truth in Lending Act provides that any party to a CONTRACT may rescind his/her consent within three business days of entering into such a contract. Without prejudice, UCC 1-308 pursuant to the Uniform Commercial Code. At this point the contract between Rene Meyer and Minnehaha county courts are now VOID!

3. When I went to turn in the paperwork at the court house at the Criminal window, they refused to take my paperwork and stamp and receive it. I had to mail it in by certified mail which reached them the following day. 7/18/2017. However the courts refused to acknowledge any of my submissions and have totally disregarded everything I have submitted. They have discriminated against me because I am not part of the club of BAR attorneys.

4. They discriminate against anyone representing themselves so I filed for a court appointed attorney. I am not sure on what day it was received but it was shortly after the second court date. First when I was in court I did not agree to anything that was said, the judge disregarded that I am a sovereign citizen and filed a pleeding even though I did not pleed to anything. I was in court at 9 am 7/26/2017 and he refused to listen to me and ordered me to come back the very next day at 9 am on 7/27/2017. He stated that if I did not show on this day that he threatened to have an officer kidnap me and take me into custody. He threatened me with bodily harm if I did not show for court the following day even though they had no jurisdiction. The judge under the first two dates was Judge Eric Johnson.

5. When I went in for the date the Jury Trial was scheduled, my name was not on the board, I found out that they had taken away my jury trial on the date it was scheduled on 11/7/2017 at 8:30 am.

I had a few meetings with my court appointed attorney Andrew Wilka, he advised me that they normally like to take away the court appointed counsel once they take away a jury trial as they were not asking for jail time however it does not give me the opportunity to clear my name thru the jury process. Even so the kangaroo courts wants to maneuver the outcome and they knew they would loose in a jury trial and that is why it was taken away from me. Because with just an executive administrator they can steer the outcome so that they do not loose. The court wants to make money on fines. Its a business and the courts have been incorporated so that they can subvert our constitutional rights. The BAR attorneys, The judge and the prosecutor are all in on the fix!

6. After the second court date, the case was appointed to Judge Patrick Schroeder. Again they refused to dismiss the case. Then sometime during February I found out that my court appointed attorney quit and the case was turned over to Lisa Capellupo who refused to see me. On 3/6/2018 I called the public defenders office and they said the case was closed and they wont set a date for me to meet with the lawyer. On 2/26/2018 I was in court with no attorney present, Lisa Capellupo refused to show even though she was assigned to my case at that point. However the judge said I was to meet with her before

the March 26 court date however I was not allowed to talk with her at all. I was informed the judge signed some papers taking away the court appointed attorney.

7. On March 26, 2018 at 3:00 and again it was canceled and moved to another date with no notification. Neither in writing nor on the phone.

This time the date was moved to April 13, 2018 at 10 am. And I have been given no court instruction on the proper procedure for how to subpoena witnesses.

8. The MINNEHAHA PUBLIC DEFENDERS refused to release my files on my case to me even though I am now representing myself. They say they will only turn it over to another attorney (whom they can buy off). On friday the 3/30/2018 I went in to get my records and the receptionist said I had to talk to the lawyer and then after receiving no phone call back I went directly into the office on friday 4/6/2018 and she, **Lisa Cappellupo refused to release any of the records to me for my own case.** This alone shows that these people have no care for the people of South Dakota and are only loyal to themselves and the system. They do not represent the people but the court.

COMPLAINT PART II

Plaintiff, Rene Meyer, 25846 Vandemark Ave, Hartford, Minnehaha County, SD 57033. Telephone number 605-430-9256.

COMPLAINT PART III

Defendants, 1. & 2. Judge Patrick Schroeder and Judge Eric Johnson

Minnehaha County Courthouse
425 N. Dakota Avenue
Sioux Falls, SD 57104

Phone number: 605-367-5900
Fax number: 605-367-5916

Defendants, 3. , 4. & 5 MINNEHAHA COUNTY INC, MINNEHAHA STATES ATTORNEYS OFFICE, Aaron McGowan who runs the States Attorneys Office in Minnehaha County.

MINNEHAHA COUNTY INC

Minnehaha County Commission Office
415 N. Dakota Ave.
Sioux Falls, SD 57104

MINNEHAHA STATES ATTORNEYS OFFICE
State's Attorney - Aaron McGowan
Minnehaha County State's Attorney
415 N. Dakota Ave.
Sioux Falls, SD 57104

Defendant 6. STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA INC., the plaintiff in my court case pending in Minnehaha county courts.

STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA INC.
Office of the Governor
500 East Capitol Avenue
Pierre, S.D. 57501
Phone 605.773.3212
Fax 605.773.4711

Defendant 7. & 8. ATTORNEY GENERAL'S OFFICE and Marty Jackley, the attorney general controls all the courts below him and he also represents the state, And is a key peace in directing the lower courts in South Dakota so he is responsible as well.

ATTORNEY GENERALS OFFICE
Marty Jackley
Office of the Attorney General
1302 E Hwy 14 , Suite 1
Pierre SD 57501-8501
Phone (605) 773-3215
Fax: (605) 773-4106

Defendant 9 & 10. MINNEHAHA PUBLIC DEFENDERS OFFICE, and public defender assigned to me, Lisa Capellupo. Who is also responsible for rigging the outcome, she works for the STATE and not the people. She does not represent the plaintiff as she really represents and is paid by the STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA.

MINNEHAHA PUBLIC DEFENDERS OFFICE
Lisa Capellupo
413 N. Main Ave.
Sioux Falls, SD 57104
(605) 367-4242

CAUSES OF ACTION & STATEMENT OF CLAIMS

1. The Minnehaha Court has no jurisdiction. I submitted notorized statements and rescinded contract. And they have failed to show how they have jurisdiction. They must prove they have it.

Title 5 U.S.C. 556(d) "When jurisdiction is challenged the burden of proof is on the government." No sanction can be imposed absent proof of jurisdiction." "Once challenged, jurisdiction can not be 'assumed', it must be proved to exist!" Stanard v Olesen 74 S. Ct. 768

"The law requires PROOF OF JURISDICTION to appear on the Record of the administrative agency and all administrative proceedings." Hagans v Lavine, 415 U.S. 533

2. Violated Law of Contracts. ANY contract has 3-business days to rescind a contract. Which was completed and notarized. Also you cannot enforce a contract that was signed under duress, job loss and threat of harm and kidnapping. UCC 1-308 uniform commercial code

3. I have stated from the beginning of this kangaroo court has no jurisdiction and **that I do not accept this offer to contract and I do not consent to these proceedings. See Affidavit of Truth filed July 26, 2017.**

4. Violates my civil rights and the Constitution that gives anyone charged Criminally, the right to a jury trial.

5. Took away my court appointed attorney and moved court dates with no sufficient notification.

6. Violates the Civil RICO ACT. The BAR violates the RICO ACT, its a club. The judge, the states attorney, attorney general, the county and state all work together to get convictions & align against the accused. Its a Kangaroo Court. It is a violation of my Civil Rights and violates the Constitution and also my rights as a sovereign.

7. Mistaken Identity. They are suing a corporation of RENE D MEYER and not the sovereign person Rene D Meyer. A corporation is known by all capital letters. They are suing the trust account RENE D MEYER that is a fictional entity. "Your honor, just to reiterate, on and for the record, i: a woman; am

here to establish i am a living being, the blood flows; the flesh lives and we are sovereign. Nothing stands between myself and the Divine Creator of All that is."

8. LAWS, only Gods law applies to Sovereign Citizens. All others are corporate statutes which are not LAWS but statutes of a fictional entity, that is incorporated. Statutes only applies to those belonging to that Corporation. So the Statutes only apply to government employees of SOUTH DAKOTA INC. THE CORPORATIONS ARE ACTING AS A GOVERNMENT WHEN THEY ARE NOT! THEY ARE CORPORATIONS. THE MINNEHAHA COUNTY IS A CORPORATION, AND SO IS THE MINNEHAHA COURT HOUSE.

9. The **Minnehaha Public Defenders** office refuses to release my records to me. **That is because their treason is in those records.** That is why Lisa Capellupo is listed as she herself refused to release my records to me. I asked for copies of all of my records on this Case. On friday the 3/30/2018 I went in to get my records and the receptionist said I had to talk to the lawyer and then after receiving no phone call back I went directly into the office on friday 4/6/2018 and she, **Lisa Cappellupo refused to release any of the records to me for my own case.** This alone shows that these people have no care for the people of South Dakota and are only loyal to themselves and the system. They do not represent the people but the court.

10. The judge is also jury and executioner. Think about it. This is how a court is suppose to operate. The judges are the referees, they are suppose to determine based on evidence if you are guilty or innocent and there is always suppose to be 3 or more judges for each panel. Not 1. The jury is suppose to determine if a crime has been committed, and its the treasurer who determines the penalties in sentencing.

They have it all backwards because its a rigged proceeding. Its all smoke and mirrors, a dog and pony show. The judge instructs the jury to weigh the evidence and reach a verdict. That is immediate tampering with a jury. That jury is not suppose to reach a verdict, the purpose of the jury is to conclude

if a crime has been committed or not, meaning the charging instrument. If the charge is not a nefarious act based on human rights abuses or war crimes, then it is not a crime. Its really that simple.

Instead we have juries finding people guilty of 3 grams cannabis possession, and then ruining peoples life because a bunch of people did not bother to learn the law. We have so many innocent people sitting in jail or prison because of incompetent juries that are told they can only rule on the evidence of the charge which is not their purpose. **And this also goes to ruining someones life over a minor that has been talked into buying alcohol for the county detective for revenue collection purposes. It does nothing to test a system.**

11. The reason all of the defendants are listed is they all have a part to play in the corruption of the judicial system to undermine the people and to use statutes to control the people instead of doing what they are supposed to do and that is to represent the people and a system of fairness. But fairness cannot exist in a corrupt system. Where payoffs and bribes and salaries determine loyalty. And the loyalty these people possess is to money and greed and power. And this goes hand in hand with total corruption. From the top down. All BAR card carrying attorneys are just a foreign agent. They have determined the outcome before I ever set foot in the courtroom. As the whole system is rigged against the accused and the harm caused does not matter when money is involved.

A. The two judges are listed because both made decisions on the case against me in the Minnehaha County Courthouse.

B. MINNEHAHA COUNTY INC, MINNEHAHA STATES ATTORNEYS OFFICE, Aaron McGowan who runs the States Attorneys Office in Minnehaha County. The county collects the fines and revenue and for the Minnehaha States Attorneys Office. And they are the direct adversary in court and helps represent the STATE. Aaron McGowan is in charge of this office. However they all work together with the judges to control the outcomes of cases.

C. STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA INC., the plaintiff in my court case pending in Minnehaha county courts. And directed by special interests that buy the STATE decisions in the direction the big banks want this country to go in which is opposite of the people determining the rules and usually in the opposite direction of what is in the best interests of the PEOPLES Constitutional rights. They buy out the direction the lower courts take and are the ones buying the judges directly.

D. ATTORNEY GENERAL'S OFFICE and Marty Jackley, the attorney general controls all the courts below him and he also represents the state, And is a key peace in directing the lower courts in South Dakota so he is responsible as well. He gets bought big time at the STATE level and that money trickles down to the lower courts and county courthouses.

E. MINNEHAHA PUBLIC DEFENDERS OFFICE, and public defender assigned to me, Lisa Capellupo. Who is also responsible for rigging the outcome, she works for the STATE and not the people. She does not represent the plaintiff as she really represents and is paid by the STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA. She has shown her treason in the records and refuses to release copies of my file at the public defenders office. She and the office is responsible for damages.

12. PLEASE SEE THE CERTIFIED COPY OF THE FILE ON MY CASE IN MINNEHAHA COURT AGAINST ME. ATTACHMENT A. THIS DOCUMENTS ALL THAT HAS HAPPENED TO ME AND THE CORRUPTION.

13. Judges are not immune to crimes against humanity or from any harm they do to the people, they take an oath and can be sued for any harm they have done to anyone.

Platsky v. C.I.A. 953 F.2d. 25. Additionally, pro se litigants are to be given reasonable opportunity to remedy the defects in their pleadings.

Warnock v. Pecos County, Tex., 88 F3d 341 (5th Cir. 1996) Eleventh Amendment does not protect state officials from claims for prospective relief when it is alleged that state officials acted in violation of federal law.

A writ of quo warranto is not a petition, but a notice of demand, issued by a demandant, to a respondent claiming some delegated power, and filed with a court of competent jurisdiction, to hold a hearing within 3 to 20 day, Tittle 3 court of Common Laws, No "Bar card" holding Judges, the respondant to the court, to present proof of his authority to execute his claimed powers, if the court fails to hold the hearing, the respondant must cease to exercise the power. If the power is to hold an office, he must vacate the office. documents to be provided in discovery before the court if you proceed : 1.Oath of Office 2. Public Hazard Bonding and information of the insurance corporation. 3.the FARA registration is in place.

Failure to file the "Foreign Agents Registrations Statement" goes directly to the jurisdiction and lack of standing to be before the court, and is a felony pursuant to 18 USC §§ 219, 951. The conflict of law, interest and allegiance is obvious."

22 C.F.R. - Code of Federal Regulations 92.12-92.31 FR Heading "Foreign Relationship" states that an oath is required to take office.

Title 8 U.S. Code 1481 states once an oath of office is taken, citizenship is relinquished, thus one becomes a foreign entity, agency, or state. That means every public office is a foreign state, including all political subdivisions. (i.e. every single court is considered a separate foreign entity)

Title 22 U.S. Code (Foreign relations and Intercourse) Chapter 11 identifies all public officials as foreign agents.

Title 28 U.S. Code 3002 Section 15A states United States is a Federal Corporation and not a government, including the Judicial Procedural Section.

Federal Rules of Civil Procedure (FRCP) 4j states that the Court jurisdiction and immunity fall under a foreign state.

Title 28 U.S. Code Chapter 176 - The Federal Debt Collection Procedure places all courts under equity and commerce and under the International Monetary Fund."

Title 28 U.S. Code 1608 No one has Absolute Immunity as a Corporation.

Title 28 U.S.Code 1602-1611 (Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act) allows the jurisdiction of a court to be challenged, and a demand of proper jurisdiction to be stated.

July 27, 1868, 15 Statutes at Large Chapter 249 Section 1 "Acts Concerning American Citizens in a Foreign State," expatriation, is what is broken when jurisdiction is demanded, and is not met with an answer.

Failure to file the "Foreign Agents Registrations Statement" goes directly to the jurisdiction and lack of standing to be before the court, and is a felony pursuant to 18 USC §§ 219, 951. The conflict of law, interest and allegiance is obvious."

That in 1950 81st Congress investigated the Lawyers Guild and determined that the B.A.R. Association is founded and run by communists under definition. Thus any elected official that is a member of the B.A.R. will only be loyal to the B.A.R. and not the people FARA registered :Under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 12b 6, the prosecution has failed to provide adequate proof that the parties involved in this situation are actually corporate entities. There is ample proof that the prosecution and other agents are actually corporations.

RICO
wrongful prosecution, abuse of powers and subversion
1. 42 ucs 1983 – Civil Action for deprivation of rights.
2. 42 usc 1986 -action of neglect to prevent, the jury is to be aware of their power of nullification and thereby have the authority to reward any amount.
3. 18 usc 1512 -tampering with witnesses and victims imformants -threats,ex..
4. 18 usc 2071 concealment removing , mutilation generally
5. 18usc 1346 artifice to defraud
6. 18 usc 1505 obstruction of proceedings
7. 42 usc 1985 conspiracy to interfere with civil rights
8. 18 usc 1513 retaliating against the witness
9. 5 cfr 2635.702 use of public office for private gain
10. 18usc 1506 theft or alteration of record or process or false bail
11. 18 usc 241 conspiracy against rights
12. 18 usc 242 deprivation of rights under color of law
13. 18 usc 1001 knowingly and willfully falsifying and concealing material fact, knowingly and willfully falsifying and concealing material fact, making materially false statements (All officers state or federal and the governor are part of the executive branch. The Sheriff, Attorney General and Judge are part of the judicial branch).

FURTHER EXPLANATION

This NOTICE is from a private non-citizen national pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(21) under Common Law Jurisdiction. "U.S. adopted common laws of England with the constitution." See Caldwell v. Hill, 178 SE 383 (1934).(22)The term "national of the United States" means (B) a person who, though not a citizen of the United States, owes permanent allegiance to the United States.

The Right of the Citizens of the several States to hold title in allodium.

The Supreme Court and Lower Courts Affirm That Americans are Sovereign Citizens.

To fully comprehend the expanse of the unalienable Rights possessed by Americans at the close of the Revolution it is only necessary to examine early court decisions. Chisholm v. Georgia 2 U.S. 419, 2 Dall.419,1 L.ED.440 (1793)

At the Revolution, the Sovereignty devolved on the people; and they are truly the Sovereigns of the country but they are Sovereigns without subjects…" Afroyim V Rusk, 387 U.S. 253 (1967)

In the United States the people are sovereign , and the government cannot sever its relationship to the people by taking away their citizenship." Lansing V Smith, 4 Wendell9, N.Y. (1829)

The people of the state, as the successors of its former sovereign are entitled to the rights which formerly belonged to the king by his own prerogative." People v.Herkimer, 4 Cowen 345,348 N.Y. (1825) The people have been ceded all the rights of the King the former sovereign." As noted within the preceding paragraph early court decisions recognized that American Citizens were now "sovereigns without subjects" and held all of the Rights which formerly belonged to the King by his own prerogative. ln Lansing v. Smith the Court used the word "prerogative" in its decision. "Prerogative " is defined as: "an exclusive right, privilege exercised by virtue of rank or office." (The Random House Dictionary of the English Language) Therefore, after the inception of the new Republic, it was recognized by the Courts that Americans now held exclusive Rights, which formerly belonged to the King alone. Americans identified such Rights as "unalienable Rights," which emanated from the throne of God.

The Citizens Right to Hold Title To Land In Allodium One Right held by the King, but no others, was the Right to hold title to land in allodium. "The King of England held ownership of land under a different title and with far greater powers than any of his subjects. Though the people of England held fee simple titles to their land, the King actually owned all the land in England through his allodial title, and though all the land was, in the feudal system, none of the fee simple titles were of equal weight and dignity with the Kings title, the land always remaining allodial in favor of the King." Gilsbert of Mons, Chonique, Ch.43, p. 75 (ed. Vanderkindere). Thus, it is relatively easy to deduce that allodial lands and titles are the highest form of lands and titles known to Common Law. At the Revolution, the Common Law was the municipal law of England.

To fully understand the Citizen's Right to own property it is necessary to understand the definition of the word allodium. Webster's dictionary (1825 Ed) states that allodium is "land which is absolute

property of the owner, real estate held in absolute independence, without being subject to any rent, service, or acknowledgement to a superior. It is thus opposed to feud." Take note of the preceding sentence, "It is thus opposed to feud." Generally, land titles are either allodial in nature where a man or woman holds the title to land by Right, and he or she does not have to pay a form of rent such as the "properly tax" or perform a service to or for a lord in order to keep title to the land, or…. land titles are feudal in nature where a man must pay a rent or provide a service to or for his superior in order to remain on the land. With any type of feudal title the man or woman NEVER owns the land. At the inception of the Republic it was determined that all land titles in America would be allodial in nature, and that all feudal tenures were abolished.

It should be noted that it is not possible for a Republic and a feudal system to coexist within the same state.

Article IV, Section 4 of the United States Constitution guarantees the South Dakota People a Constitutional Republic: "The United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union a Republican Form of Government…

The initial state constitutions and the Virginia Declaration of Rights written at the time of the Revolution confirm that the possession of land was an unalienable Right, and as governments within America were "instituted to secure Rights,"the possession of land must be an unalienable Right today. If government does not recognize that land ownership remains an unalienable Right then government has failed to perform its primary duty which is securing the Rights of the People. Joseph L. Story appointed by President Madison to the Supreme Court (1811-1845) wrote in his Commentaries on the Constitution (I 833): "The sacred rights of property are to be guarded at every point. I call them sacred, because, if they are unprotected, all other rights become worthless or visionary. What is personal liberty, if it does not draw after it the right to enjoy the fruits of our industry? What is political liberty, if it imparts only perpetual poverty to us and all of our posterity? What is the privilege of the vote, if the majority of the hour may sweep away the earnings of our whole lives, to gratify the rapacity of the indolent, the cunning, or the profligate, who are born into power upon the tide of a temporary popularity?"

The Virginia Declaration of Rights (1766) asserts that: "All men are born equally free and independent and have certain inherent natural rights, of which they can not by any compact, deprive or divest their

posterity; among which are the enjoyment of life and liberty, with the means of acquiring and possessing property, and pursuing and obtaining happiness and safety."

The Constitution of Pennsylvania of August 16,1776, affirmed: "That all men are born equally free and independent, and have certain natural. inherent and inalienable rights. amongst which are, the enjoying and defending life and liberty, acquiring, possessions and protecting property, and pursuing and obtaining happiness and safety."

The Constitution of Vermont of July 8,1777, affirmed: "That all men are bom equally free and independent, and have certain natural, inherent and unalienable_rights, amongst which are the enjoying and defending life and liberty: acquiring, possessing and protecting property, and pursuing and obtaining happiness and safety.

The Constitution of Massachusetts of October 25,1780, recognized: "All men are born free and equal, and have certain natural, inherent and unalienable rights; among which may be reckoned the right of enjoying and defending their lives and liberties; that of acquiring, possessing, and protecting property; in fine, that of seeking and obtaining their safety and happiness."

The Constitution of New Hampshire of June 2,1784, affirmed: "All men have certain natural, essential, and inherent rights; among which are – the enjoying and defending life and liberty – acquiring, possessing and protecting property – and in a word, of seeking and obtaining happiness." Possession of property at the time of the Revolution was defined as: "The detention or enjoyment of a thing which a man holds or exercises by himself or by another who keeps or exercises it in his name. By the possession of a thing, we always conceive the condition, in which not only one's own dealing with the thing is physically possible, but every other person's dealing with it is capable of being excluded." (See: Bouvier's Dictionary of Law 1856)

After reading the above state constitutions it is quite easy to deduce that at the Revolution the possession of property was considered an inalienable Right. **It should also be understood that a natural Right referred to in the constitutions noted above was a Right endowed by God. A natural Right was founded upon God's Law or in the terms of that day the Law of Nature and Nature's God. A natural Right as it originated with God must be termed an unalienable Right.**

Blackstone in his Commentaries on the Laws of England (1765-1769) at number 41 stated: "This law of nature. being coeval with mankind and dictated bv God himself. is of course superior in obligation to any other. It is binding over all the globe in all countries. and at all times: no human laws are of any

validity. if contrary to this: and such of them as are valid.. derive all their force, and all their authority, mediaty or immediately. from this original." Further, early court decisions of the 19ft century specifically affirm that the title to land held by all Americans was allodial in nature. Wallace v. Harmstal- 44Pa. 492 (1863)

I see no way of solving this question, except by determining whether our Pennsylvania titles are allodial or feudal….

I venture to suggest that much of the confusion of ideas that prevails on this subject has come from our retaining, since the American Revolution, the feudal nomenclature of estates and tenures, as fee, freehold, heirs, feeoffment, and the like. …We are then to regard the Revolution and these Acts of Assembly as emancipating every acre of soil of Pennsylvania from the grand characteristics of the feudal system. Even to the lands held by the proprietaries themselves, they held them as other citizens held, under the Commonwealth, and that by title purely allodial." hlatthews v. Ward,l0 Gill & J. (Md.) 443 (1839), "…after the American Revolution lands in this state (Maryland) became allodial, subject to no tenure, nor to any services incident there to." Stanton v. Sullivon, 63 R.I. 216,7 A.696 (1839) "Thus, it is relatively easy to deduce that all allodial lands and titles are the highest form of lands and titles known_to the Common Law.

An estate of inheritance without condition, belonging to the owner, and alienable by him, transmissible to his heirs absolutely and simply, is an absolute estate in perpetuity and the largest estate a man can have, being in fact allodial in nature."

In 1881 the 46ft Congress commissioned the work: with Statistics within this work pursuant to the Northwest Ordinance of 1787 are the following excerpts pertaining to feudal tenures (conditions) in America. "The ordinance of 1787 was the first general legislation by the Congress of the United States on the subject of real property. In it the leading features of feudalism are specifically repealed. Since the period of its passage the policy of the jurisprudence of the United States is not to encourage restraints upon the power of alienation of land. Free and unconditional alienation is now the rule of the National Government in the disposal of the public domain, and encouraged by all the states and Territories in land transfers." (Page 156, paragraph 5)

"Most of the feudal incidents of tenure (which in the colonies were mere form) were abolished in many of the States after the Revolution, and by the United States in the immortal ordinance of 1787, the most progressive and republican act ever performed by a nation in relation to the estates of her people. It

made the individual absolutely independent of the State, and the entire owner of his or her home." (Page 157, paragraph 1) Note that this paragraph confirms that feudalism and a Republican form of government cannot coexist.

The U.S. Constitution at Article1,Section 10 states:

No State shall enter into any treaty, alliance, or confederation; grant letters of marque and reprisal; coin money; emit bills of credit; make anything but gold and silver coin a tender in payment of debts; pass any bill of attainder, ex post facto law, or law impairing the obligation of contracts, or grant any title of nobility." The courts have found the land patent to be "contract executed" (Fletcher v. Peck) and no state may, pursuant to the United States Constitution at Article l, section10 impair "the obligation of contracts." Lands that were held in trust by the Federal Government prior to being made patent by a Citizen were termed ungranted or unappropriated public lands. This may be confirmed by reading the Homestead Act of 1862. (ADD EXCERPT FROM THE HOMESTEAD ACT)

The Arizona Enabling Act at Section 20, Second states in pertinent part: "That the people inhabiting said proposed State do agree and declare that they forever disclaim all right and title to the unappropriated and ungranted public lands lying within the boundaries thereof…" As the Arizona people have disclaimed all right and title to said lands forever, and as "all political power is inherent in the people" (See:Arizona Constitution Article 2, Section 2) The State of Arizona has no authority to tax, regulate, zone, or in any way enact legislation that affects land, which was considered "unappropriated and ungranted public lands," when Arizona was admitted to the union of the several States. Further, there is no mention within the Arizona Enabling Act that the Arizona people regain any right to tax and/or regulate said "ungranted" and "unappropriated" lands when said lands are granted by the Federal Government to a Citizen at a date subsequent to statehood. The State of Arizona cannot unilaterally amend the Arizona Enabling Act. Within Section 20 of said Act it states that the Act can only be amended with the consent of the Arizona People and the United States. ALL OF THIS APPLIES FOR SOUTH DAKOTA AS WELL.

A writ of quo warranto is not a petition, but a notice of demand, issued by a demandant, to a respondent claiming some delegated power, and filed with a court of competent jurisdiction, to hold a hearing within 3 to 20 day, Tittle 3 court of Common Laws, No "Bar card" holding Judges, the respondant to the court, to present proof of his authority to execute his claimed powers, if the court fails to hold the

hearing, the respondant must cease to exercise the power. If the power is to hold an office, he must vacate the office.

documents to be provided in discovery before the court if you proceed : 1.Oath of Office 2. Public Hazard Bonding and information of the insurance corporation. 3.the FARA registration is in place. Failure to file the "Foreign Agents Registrations Statement" goes directly to the jurisdiction and lack of standing to be before the court, and is a felony pursuant to 18 USC §§ 219, 951. The conflict of law, interest and allegiance is obvious."

22 C.F.R. - Code of Federal Regulations 92.12-92.31 FR Heading "Foreign Relationship" states that an oath is required to take office.

Title 8 U.S. Code 1481 states once an oath of office is taken, citizenship is relinquished, thus one becomes a foreign entity, agency, or state. That means every public office is a foreign state, including all political subdivisions. (i.e. every single court is considered a separate foreign entity)

Title 22 U.S. Code (Foreign relations and Intercourse) Chapter 11 identifies all public officials as foreign agents.

Title 28 U.S. Code 3002 Section 15A states United States is a Federal Corporation and not a government, including the Judicial Procedural Section.

Federal Rules of Civil Procedure (FRCP) 4j states that the Court jurisdiction and immunity fall under a foreign state.

Title 28 U.S. Code Chapter 176 - The Federal Debt Collection Procedure places all courts under equity and commerce and under the International Monetary Fund."

U.S. citizens (FEDERAL CITIZENS) are FOREIGN to the several States and subjects of the FEDERAL UNITED STATES/STATE of NEW COLUMBIA/ DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

"A "US Citizen" upon leaving the District of Columbia becomes involved in "interstate commerce", as a "resident" does not have the common-law right to travel, of a Citizen of one of the several states." Hendrick v. Maryland S.C. Reporter's Rd. 610-625. (1914)

"The term resident and citizen of the United States is distinguished from a Citizen of one of the several states, in that the former is a special class of citizen created by Congress." U.S. v. Anthony 24 Fed. 829 (1873)

Government Is Foreclosed from Parity with Real People. It is a VIOLATION of the 11th Amendment for a FOREIGN CITIZEN to INVOKE the JUDICIAL POWER of the State

The 11th Amendment (Article XI) states "The Judicial power of the United States shall not be construed to extend to any suit in law or equity, commenced or prosecuted against one of the United States by Citizens of another State, or by Citizens or Subjects of a Foreign State." (A foreign entity, agency, or state cannot bring any suit against a United States citizen without abiding the following procedure.)

Title 22 C.F.R. 93.1-93.2 states that the Department of State has to be notified of any suit, and in turn has to notify the United States citizen of said suit.

Title 28 U.S. Code 1330 states that the United States District Court has to grant permission for the suit to be pursued once the court has been supplied sufficient proof that the United States citizen is actually a corporate entity.

Title 28 U.S. Code 1608 No one has Absolute Immunity as a Corporation.

Title 28 U.S.Code 1602-1611 (Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act) allows the jurisdiction of a court to be challenged, and a demand of proper jurisdiction to be stated.

July 27, 1868, 15 Statutes at Large Chapter 249 Section 1 "Acts Concerning American Citizens in a Foreign State," expatriation, is what is broken when jurisdiction is demanded, and is not met with an answer.

That in 1950 81st Congress investigated the Lawyers Guild and determined that the B.A.R. Association is founded and run by communists under definition. Thus any elected official that is a member of the B.A.R. will only be loyal to the B.A.R. and not the people FARA registered :Under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 12b 6, the prosecution has failed to provide adequate proof that the parties involved in this situation are actually corporate entities. There is ample proof that the prosecution and other agents are actually corporations.

15 U.S. Code § 7001 - General rule of validity:(a) In general Notwithstanding any statute, regulation, or other rule of law (other than this subchapter and subchapter II), with respect to any transaction in or affecting interstate or foreign commerce— (1) a signature, contract, or other record relating to such transaction may not be denied legal effect, validity, or enforceability solely because it is in electronic form; and (2) a contract relating to such transaction may not be denied legal effect, validity, or enforceability solely because an electronic signature or electronic record was used in its formation..

Supreme court case testimony states there is no such thing as a law license.

Please refer to this following supreme court case laws for the constitution for the united states.

* Picking v. Pennsylvania R. Co. 151 Fed. 2nd 240; Pucket v. Cox 456 2nd 233. Pro se pleadings are to be considered without regard to technicality; pro se litigants

pleadings are not to be held to the same high standards of perfection as lawyers.

1. Platsky v. C.I.A. 953 F.2d. 25. Additionally, pro se litigants are to be given reasonable opportunity to remedy the defects in their pleadings.

Reynoldson v. Shillinger 907F .2d 124, 126 (10th Cir. 1990); See also Jaxon v. Circle K. Corp. 773 F.2d 1138, 1140 (10th Cir. 1985) (1)

2. Haines v. Kerner (92 S.Ct. 594). The respondent in this action is a nonlawyer and is moving forward in Propria persona.

3. NAACP v. Button (371 U.S. 415); United Mineworkers of America v. Gibbs (383 U.S. 715); and Johnson v. Avery 89 S. Ct. 747 (1969).

Members of groups who are competent nonlawyers can assist other members of the group achieve the goals of the group in court without being charged with "Unauthorized practice of law."

4. Brotherhood of Trainmen v. Virginia ex rel. Virginia State Bar (377 U.S. 1); Gideon v. Wainwright 372 U.S. 335; Argersinger v. Hamlin, Sheriff 407 U.S. 425. Litigants may be assisted by unlicensed layman during judicial proceedings.

5. Howlett v. Rose, 496 U.S. 356 (1990) Federal Law and Supreme Court Cases apply to State Court Cases

6. Federal Rules Civil Proc., Rule 17, 28 U.S.C.A. "Next Friend" A next friend is a person who represents someone who is unable to tend to his or her own interest.

7. Oklahoma Court Rules and Procedures, Title 12, sec. 2017 (C) "If an infant or incompetent person does not have a duly appointed representative he may sue by his next friend or by a guardian ad litem."

8. Mandonado-Denis v. Castillo-Rodriguez, 23 F.3d 576 (1st Cir. 1994) Inadequate training of subordinates may be basis for 1983 claim.

9. Warnock v. Pecos County, Tex., 88 F3d 341 (5th Cir. 1996) Eleventh Amendment does not protect state officials from claims

for prospective relief when it is alleged that state officials acted in violation of federal law.

10. Title 42 U.S.C. Sec. 1983, Wood v. Breier, 54 F.R.D. 7, 10-11 (E.D. Wis. 1972). Frankenhauser v. Rizzo, 59 F.R.D. 339 (E.D. Pa. 1973). "Each citizen acts as a private attorney general who 'takes on the mantel of sovereign',"

11. Oklahoma is a "Right to Work" State! Bill SJR1! Its OK to practice God`s law with out a license, Luke 11:52, God`s Law was here first! "There is a higher loyalty than loyalty to this country, loyalty to God" U.S. v. Seeger,
380 U.S. 163, 172, 85 S. Ct. 850, 13 L. Ed. 2d 733 (1965)
12. "The practice of law can not be licensed by any state/State. Schware v. Board of Examiners, United States Reports 353 U.S. pgs. 238, 239. In Sims v. Aherns, 271 S.W. 720 (1925) "The practice of law is an occupation of common right.

" A bar card is not a license, its a dues card and/or membership card. A bar association is that what it is, a club.

An association is not license, it has a certificate though the State, the two are not the same....
The judges oath of office states that the judges swears to uphold and acquiesce to the constitution for the united states in all cases, and will defend the constitution for the united states against all entities foreign and domestic. Being that there is no such thing as a law license the law is an open occupation to all that can comprehended, or elucidate it. Some states and judicial officials are operating in a for profit corporation in which some judges are getting a kick back check into their retirement fund and receive money from the trust of the accused. Also they take bribes and other forms of payment from big banks and politicians to sway policy against the people. They get kickbacks from the county and cities that they collect money from fines and jailing innocent people.
Marbury v. Madison, 5 U.S. 1 Cranch 137 137 (1803)
"No provision of the Constitution is designed to be without effect," "Anything that is in conflict is null and void of law", "Clearly, for a secondary law to come in conflict with the supreme Law was illogical, for certainly, the supreme Law would prevail over all other laws and certainly our forefathers had intended that the supreme Law would be the bases of all law and for any law to come in conflict would be null and void of law, it would bare no power to enforce, in would bare no obligation to obey, it would purport to settle as if it had never existed, for unconstitutionality would date from the enactment of such a law, not from the date so branded in an open court of law, no courts are bound to uphold it, and no Citizens are bound to obey it. It operates as a near nullity or a fiction of law."

16Am Jur 2d., Sec. 97:

"Then a constitution should receive a literal interpretation in favor of the Citizen, is especially true, with respect to those provisions which were designed to safeguard the liberty and security of the Citizen in regard to person and property." Bary v. United States - 273 US 128

Bryer's v United States 273 U.S. 28. In other words it"s supposed to be

liberally enforced in favor of the citizen for the protections of their rights and property. Any constitutional provision intended to confer a benefit should be liberally construed in favor of the clearly intended and expressly designated beneficiary

Dejammer v hoskill of Albany

"No provision of the Constitution is designed to be without effect," "Anything that is in conflict is null and void of law", "Clearly, for a secondary law to come in conflict with the supreme Law was illogical, for certainly, the supreme Law would prevail over all other laws and certainly our forefathers had intended that the supreme Law would be the bases of all law and for any law to come in conflict would be null and void of law, it would bare no power to enforce, in would bare no obligation to obey, it would purport to settle as if it had never existed, for unconstitutionality would date from the enactment of such a law, not from the date so branded in an open court of law, no courts are bound to uphold it, and no Citizens are bound to obey it. It operates as a near nullity or a fiction of law."

16 Am. Jur. 2d, Sec. 178)

The general rule is that an unconstitutional statute, though having the form and the name of law, is in reality no law, but is wholly void and ineffective for any purpose since unconstitutionality dates from the time of its enactment and not merely from the date of the decision so branding it; an unconstitutional law, in legal contemplation, is as inoperative as if it had never been passed ... An unconstitutional law is void.

Norton v. Shelby County, 118 U.S. 425 (1886)

" An unconstitutional act is not law. It confers no rights, it imposes no duties, it affords no protections, it creates no office. It is in legal contemplation as inoperative as though it has never been

passed ."

"The court follows the decision of the highest court of the state, in construing the constitution and the laws of the state unless they conflict with or impair the efficacy of some principle of the Federal Constitution or of the Federal Statutes or rule of the commercial or general law. The decision of the state court's in questions relating to the existence of its subordinate tribunals and eligibility in elections

or appointment of their officers and the passage of its laws are conclusive upon Federal Courts. While acts of de facto incumbent of an office lawfully created by law. An existing or often held to be binding from reasons of public policy. The acts of the person assuming to fill and perform the duties of an office, which does not exist, can have no validity whatever in law ."
16Am Jur 2d., Sec. 256:

" The general rule is that a unconstitutional statute, whether Federal or State, though having the form and name of law as in reality no law, but is wholly void and ineffective for any purpose since unconstitutionality dates from the enactment and not merrily from the date of the decision so braining it .

An unconstitutional law in legal contemplation is as inoperative as if it never had been passed . Such a statute lives a question that is purports to settle just as it would be had the statute not ever been enacted. No repeal of an enactment is necessary, since an unconstitutional law is void . The general principles follows that it imposes no duty, converse no rights, creates no office, bestows no power of authority on anyone, affords no protection and justifies no acts performed under it . A contract which rests on a unconstitutional statute creates no obligation to be impaired by subsequent legislation. No one is bound to obey an unconstitutional law. No courts are bound to enforce it. Persons convicted and fined under a statute subsequently held unconstitutional may recover the fines paid. A void act cannot be legally inconsistent with a valid one and an unconstitutional law cannot operate to supersede an existing valid law . Indeed, in so far as a statute runs counter to the fundamental law of the land, it is superseded thereby. Since an unconstitutional statute cannot repeal, or in anyway effect an existing one, if a repealing statute is unconstitutional, the statute which it attempts to repeal, remains in full force and effect
and where a statute in which it attempts to repeal remains in full force and effect and where a clause repealing a prior law is inserted in the act, which act is unconstitutional and void, the provision of the repeal of the prior law will usually fall with it and will not be permitted to operate as repealing such prior
law. The general principle stated above applied to the constitution as well as the laws of the several states insofar as they are repugnant to the constitution and laws of the United States ."

No one has a law license, the bar gives students a bars dues card - A BAR CARD IS NOT A LICENSE- Corpus Juris Secundum, Volume 7, Section 4 anyone can call the bar, or any other department in this country an ask about a law license and they will tell you to call the bar - BRITISH ACCREDITATION REGISTRY. They will give any one that pays the membership fee a Bar Card.

Under Title 28 3002 in which if you are not a citizen of federal nationally the state will call you a sovereign citizen, which is suppose to be a bad word. Only god is sovereign and I strongly suggest that every goggle sovereignty of god. The Constitution of the United State which is ratified and called on by the sovereign creator and worked by we the people. Everyone that doesn't want a cuspid number which is on the back of your birth certificate in red numbers is being labeled a sovereign terrorist.

1 A judges oath of office - see that they are sworn to uphold, defend and acquiesce to the American Constitution for the United States.

2 Every attorney and state prosecutor is bound and sworn to uphold the America constitution, for the constitution is built around Ecclesiastes, Deuteronomy, and Leviticus.

3. Norton v. Shelby County, 118 U.S. 425 (1886)

" An unconstitutional act is not law. It confers no rights, it imposes no duties, it affords no protections, it creates no office. It is in legal contemplation as inoperative as though it has never been passed ."

"The court follows the decision of the highest court of the state, in construing the constitution and the laws of the state unless they conflict with or impair the efficacy of some principle of the Federal Constitution or of the Federal Statutes or rule of the commercial or general law. The decision of the state court's in questions relating to the existence of its subordinate tribunals and eligibility in elections or appointment of their officers and the passage of its laws are conclusive upon Federal Courts. While acts of de facto incumbent of an office lawfully created by law. An existing or often held to be binding from reasons of public policy. The acts of the person assuming to fill and perform the duties of an office, which does not exist, can have no validity whatever in law ."

4 Marbury v. Madison, 5 U.S. 1 Cranch 137 137 (1803)

"No provision of the Constitution is designed to be without effect," "Anything that is in conflict is

null and void of law", "Clearly, for a secondary law to come in conflict with the supreme Law was illogical, for certainly, the supreme Law would prevail over all other laws and certainly our forefathers had intended that the supreme Law would be the bases of all law and for any law to come in conflict would be null and void of law, it would bare no power to enforce, in would bare no obligation to obey, it would purport to settle as if it had never existed, for unconstitutionality would date from the enactment of such a law, not from the date so branded in an open court of law, no courts are bound to uphold it, and no Citizens are bound to obey it. It operates as a near nullity or a fiction of law."

5 Miranda v. Arizona, 384 U.S. 436 (1966)

"In the absence of other effective measures, the following procedures to safeguard the fifth amendment privileges must be observed. The person in custody must prior to interrogation be clearly informed that he has a right to remain silent and that anything he says will be used against him in a court of law. He must be clearly informed that he has a right to consult with a lawyer, to have a lawyer with him during interrogation and that if he is indigent, a lawyer will be appointed to represent him. If the individual indicates prior to and during questioning that he wishes to remain silent, the interrogation must cease. If he states that he wants an attorney, the questioning must cease until an attorney is present. Where an interrogation is conducted without the presence of an attorney and a statement is taken, a heavy burden rests on the government to demonstrate that the defendant knowingly and intelligently waived his constitutional consul right. Where the individual answers some questions during interrogation or cuts the interrogation, he has not waived his privilege and may invoke his right to remain silent thereafter. The warnings require that the waver needed our, in the absence of a fully effective equivalent perquisites to the admission or admissibility of any statement, inculpability or exculpability made by the defendant. The limitations on the interrogation presses required for the protection of the individual's constitutional rights should not cause an undue interference the proper system of law enforcement as demonstrated by the procedures of the FBI and the safeguards afforded to other jurisdictions. In each of these cases the statements were obtained under circumstances that did not meet constitutional standards for protection of the privilege against self incrimination."

" Where rights secured by the constitution are involved, there can be no rule or law making or legislation which would abrogate or abolish them ."

6 Maine v. Thiboutot, 448 U.S. 1 (1980)

The right of action created by statute relating to deprivation under color of law, of a right secured by the constitution and the laws of the United States and comes claims which are based solely on

statutory violations of Federal Law and applied to the claim that claimants had been deprived of their rights, in some capacity, to which they were entitled."

" Officers of the court have no immunity when violating constitutional right, from liability "

Norton v. Shelby County 118 USR 425:

" An unconstitutional act is not law. It confers no rights, it imposes no duties, it affords no protections, it creates no office. It is in legal contemplation as inoperative as though it has never been passed ."

"The court follows the decision of the highest court of the state, in construing the constitution and the laws of the state unless they conflict with or impair the efficacy of some principle of the Federal Constitution or of the Federal Statutes or rule of the commercial or general law. The decision of the state court's in questions relating to the existence of its subordinate tribunals and eligibility in elections or

appointment of their officers and the passage of its laws are conclusive upon Federal Courts. While acts of de facto incumbent of an office lawfully created by law. An existing or often held to be binding from reasons of public policy. The acts of the person assuming to fill and perform the duties of an office, which does not exist, can have no validity whatever in law ."

16Am Jur 2d., Sec. 256:

" The general rule is that a unconstitutional statute, whether Federal or State, though having the form and name of law as in reality no law, but is wholly void and ineffective for any purpose since unconstitutionality dates from the enactment and not merrily from the date of the decision so braining it .An unconstitutional law in legal contemplation is as inoperative as if it never had been passed . Such a statute lives a question that is purports to settle just as it would be had the statute not ever been enacted. No repeal of an enactment is necessary, since an unconstitutional law is void . The general principles follows that it imposes no duty, converse no rights, creates no office, bestows no power of authority on anyone, affords no protection and justifies no acts performed under it . A contract which rests on a unconstitutional statute creates no obligation to be impaired by subsequent legislation. No one is bound to obey an unconstitutional law. No courts are bound to enforce it. Persons convicted and fined under a statute subsequently held unconstitutional may recover the fines paid. A void act cannot be legally inconsistent with a valid one and an unconstitutional law cannot operate to supersede an existing valid law . Indeed, in so far as a statute runs counter to the fundamental law of the land, it is superseded thereby. Since an unconstitutional statute cannot repeal, or in anyway effect an existing one, if a

repealing statute is unconstitutional, the statute which it attempts to repeal, remains in full force and effect
and where a statute in which it attempts to repeal remains in full force and effect and where a clause repealing a prior law is inserted in the act, which act is unconstitutional and void, the provision of the repeal of the prior law will usually fall with it and will not be permitted to operate as repealing such prior
law. The general principle stated above applied to the constitution as well as the laws of the several states insofar as they are repugnant to the constitution and laws of the United States ."
Bryer's v United States 273 U.S. 28. In other words it"s supposed to be liberally enforced in favor of the citizen for the protections of their rights and property. Any constitutional provision intended to confer a benefit should be liberally construed in favor of the clearly intended and expressly designated beneficiary. The Constitution is built on around Ecclesiastes, Deuteronomy, and Leviticus.

The United States is a "Federal Corporation": 28 U.S.C. § 3002(15) a small group of extortionist are trying to buy America. It would be in everyones best interest to take into consideration the following many states are abiding by state law and not the constitution. but they are obligated to following the constitution for the united states first and above all else or they violate their oath of office under 18 U.S.C. § 2381
Am Jur 256: The general rule is that an unconstitutional statute, whether federal or state,
though having the form and name of law is reality no law; but is wholly void and ineffective for any purpose. Since unconstitutionality dates from the time of the enactment, not merely from the date of the decision so branding it. An unconstitutional law in legal contemplation is as inoperative as if it had never been passed. Such a statute leaves a question that it purports to settle just as it would be had the statute not ever been enacted.
No repeal of an enactment is necessary since an unconstitutional law is void. The general principle follows that it imposes no duties, confers no rights, creates no office, bestows no power or authority on anyone, affords no protection, and justifies no acts performed under it. A contract which rests on an unconstitutional statue creates no obligation to be impaired by subsequent legislation.

No one is bound to obey an unconstitutional law, and no courts are bound to enforce it.

Persons convicted and fined under a statute subsequently held unconstitutional may recover the fines paid. A void act cannot be legally inconsistent with a valid one, and an unconstitutional law cannot operate to supersede an existing valid law. Indeed insofar as a statute runs counter to the fundamental law of the land, it is superseded thereby. Since an unconstitutional statute cannot repeal or in any way affect and existing one, if a repealing statute is unconstitutional, the statute which it attempts to repeal remains in full force and effect. Where a clause repealing a prior law is inserted in the act, which act in unconstitutional and void, the provision of the repeal of the prior law will usually fall with it, and will not be permitted to operate as repealing such prior law.

The general principle stated above applies to the constitution as well as the laws of the several states insofar as they are repugnant to the constitution and the laws of the United States. Moreover a construction of a statute which brings in conflict with a constitution will nullify it as effectively as if it had in its expressed terms been enacted in conflict therewith. Anything passed in conflict with the constitution is clearly unconstitutional.

Bryer's v United States 273 U.S. 28. In other words it"s supposed to be liberally enforced in favor of the citizen for the protections of their rights and property. Any constitutional provision intended to confer a benefit should be liberally construed in favor of the

clearly intended and expressly designated beneficiary.

Please take into consideration the following The constitution is built on around Ecclesiastes, Deuteronomy, and Leviticus.

Rene Meyer would like all to see the devastating effect of one person being tormented by corrupt juridical officials not honoring there oath of office. I take very seriously what Jesus Christ said.

Matthew 25:40 "The King will reply, 'Truly I tell you, whatever you did for one of the least of these brothers and sisters of mine, you did for me.'

Matthew 19:14 Jesus said, "Let the little children come to me, and do not hinder them, for the kingdom of heaven belongs to such as these."

Ephesians 6:12 For our struggle is not against flesh and blood, but against the rulers, against the authorities, against the powers of this dark world and against the spiritual forces of evil in the heavenly realms.

John 15:13 Greater love has no one than this: to lay down one's life for one's friends.

Matthew 22:39 And the second is like it: 'Love your neighbor as yourself.

Rene Meyer is a not a foreign nationality. Meyer said that she does agree with all state law that does not violate God's Law or supports The American Constitution for the United States.

"Sovereignty itself (Got and WE the PEOPLE by Gods Grace) is, of course, not subject to law, for it is the author and the source of law; but in our system, while sovereign powers are delegated to the agencies of government, sovereignty itself remains with the people, by whom and for whom all government exists and acts, And the law is the definition and limitation of power,..." "Sovereignty means that the decree of sovereign makes law and foreign courts cannot condemn influences persuading sovereign to make the decree." "The people of this State, as the successors of its former sovereign, are entitled to all the rights which formerly belonged to the King by his prerogative." And, "The state cannot diminish the rights of the people." **"Supreme sovereignty is in the people and no authority can, on any pretense whatsoever, be exercised over the citizens of this state, but such as it is or shall be derived from and granted by the people of this state."**

Thereby We the People ordained and established the Constitution for the United States of America. We the People vested Congress with statute making powers. We the people defined and limited that power of statute making. We the People limited law making powers to ourselves alone. We the People did not ves the Judiciary with law making powers. We the people are the "judicial tribunal having attributes and exercising functions independently of the person of the magistrate designated generally to hold it, and proceeding according to the course of common law."

"The constitutions of most of our states assert that all power is inherent in the people; that they may exercise it by themselves, in all cases to which they think themselves competent, as in electing their functionaries executive and legislative, and deciding by a jury of themselves, both fact and law, in all judiciary cases in which any fact is involved..."

HAND BOOK FOR FEDERAL GRAND JURORS
SUBVERTS THE AUTHOR & SOURCE OF LAW

The federal Grand Jury Handbook, which was written by the American Bar Association, makes the following 11 foundational false claims thereby creating a statutory grand jury under government

control and not the control of a Free and Sovereign People thus rendering use of these indictments a nullity. (1) The jury derives its authority from the Constitution, legislated statutes and the court rules. (2) The first grand jury consisted of 12 men who were summoned. (3) Grand jurors originally functioned as accusers or witnesses, rather than as judges. (4) The Grand jury hears only that evidence presented by United States Attorney. (5) A Grand jury is not necessary for prison sentencing less than one year. (6) A person may waive grand jury proceedings and agree to be prosecuted. (7) The grand jury is not free to compel a trial of anyone it chooses. (8) The government attorney must sign the indictment before a party may be prosecuted. (9) The grand jury is to consult the government before undertaking a formal investigation. (10) The grand jury cannon investigate without government approval. (11) The grand jury is composed of 23 government qualified persons.

REBUTTAL #1. The Jury is an unalienable right derived from God and the process by which we have government consent of the People. Quoting US v Williams "Because the grand jury is an institution separate from the courts, over whose functioning the courts do not preside, we think it clear that, as a general matter at least, no such "supervisory" judicial authority exists, and that the disclosure rule applied here exceeded the Tenth Circuits authority. "Rooted in long centuries of Anglo-American history," Hannah v Larche, 363 US 420, 490 80 S.Ct. 1502, 1544, L.Ed. 2D 1307 (1960) In fact the whole theory of its function is that it belongs to no branch of the institutional government, serving as a kind of buffer or referee between the Government and the people. Stirone v. United States, 361 US 212, 218, 80 S. Ct. 270, 273, 4 L.Ed. 2D 252 (1960)

REBUTTAL #2. Magna Carta Paragraph 52 says that the first known grand jury organized themselves and acted under the authority of the Sovereign People and is made up of "five and twenty jurors of whom mention is made below in the clause for securing the peace."

REBUTTAL #3. Magna Carta, being the equivalent to our Declaration of Independence in the People being the consentors and the putting down of tyrants, Paragraph 52 says that the grand jury is the Sureties of the Peace whereas we read: " If anyone has been dispossessed without the legal judgment of his peers, from his lands, castles, franchises or from his right, we will immediately restore them to him; and if a dispute arise over this, then let it be decided by the five and twenty jurors of whom mention is made below in the clause for securing the peace. Moreover, for all those possessions, from which anyone has, without the lawful judgment of his peers, been disseized or removed by our government we will immediately grant full justice therein."

REBUTTAL #4. Again, the aforesaid would deny government by consent and place WE the PEOPLE in subjection to our servant prosecutor. Quoting US v Williams " The grand jury's functional independence from the judicial branch is evident both in the scope of its power to investigate criminal wrongdoing, and in the manner in which that power is exercised. 'Unlike a court, whose jurisdiction is predicated upon a specific case or controversy, the grand jury 'can investigate merely on suspicion that the law is being violated, or even because it wants assurance that it is not.' " United States v R Enterprises, 48 US ---,---, 111 S. Ct. 722, 726, 112 l. Ed 2d 795 (1991)

REBUTTAL #5 the handbook Infers that an indictment is not necessary for legislated sentencing of crimes calling for less that a year imprisonment, which is wrong. The unalienable right of a grand jury is a part of due process of law and cannot be denied if the unalienable right of liberty hangs in the balance. Amendment V: No person shall be held to answer for a capital, or otherwise infamous crime, unless on a presentment or indictment of a Grand Jury… nor be deprived of life, liberty or property, without due process of law.

REBUTTAL #6. The 5th Amendment denied the aforesaid conclusion when WE the PEOPLE said "No person shall be held to answer" therefore an information from a prosecutor in place of a grand jury indictment is repugnant and void for it too easily opens the door of abuse under color of law for extortion and vindictive prosecution.

REBUTTAL #7 & #8 The aforesaid would deny government by consent and place WE the PEOPLE in subjection to our servant prosecutor. Quoting US v Williams "The grand jury requires no authorization from its constituting court to initiate an investigation, see Hale, supra, 201 US, at 59-60, 65, 26 S. Ct. at 373, 375, nor does the prosecutor require leave of court to seek a grand jury indictment. And in its day-to-day functioning, the grand jury generally operates without the interference of a presiding judge. See Calandra, supra, 414 US at 343, 94 S. Ct. at 617. It swears in its own witnesses, fed. Rule Crim. Proc. 6(c) and deliberates in total secrecy, see United States v Sells Engineering, Inc., 463 US at 424-425, 103 S. Ct. at 3138. … The grand jury remains "free to pursue its investigations unhindered by external influence or supervision so long as it does not trench upon the legitimate rights of any witness called before it." United States v Dionisio, 410 US 1, 17-18, 93 S. Ct. 764, 773, 35 L. Ed. 2D 67 (1973) There is yet another respect in which respondent's proposal not only fails to comport with, but positively contradicts, the "common law" of the Fifth Amendment grand jury. Motions to quash indictments based upon the sufficiency of the evidence relied upon by the grand jury were unheard of at comom law in England, see, e.g. People v Restenblatt, 1 Abb. Prac. 268, 269 (Ct.Gen.Sess.NY1855)

And the traditional American practice was described by Justice Nelson, riding circuit in 1852 as follows:

"No case has been cited, nor have we been able to find any, furnishing an authority for looking into and revising the judgment of the grand jury upon the evidence, for the purpose of determining whether or not the finding was founded upon sufficient proof, or whether there was a deficiency in respect to any part of the complaint. . . ."United States v. Reed, 27 Fed.Cas. 727, 738 (No. 16,134)(CCNDNY1852), We accepted Justice Nelson's description Costello v United States, 350 US 359, 76 S.Ct. 406, 100 L.Ed. 397 (1956) where we held that "it would run counter to the whole history of the grand jury institution" to permit an indictment to be challenged "on the ground that there was incompetent or inadequate evidence before the grand jury." Id., at 363-364, 76 S.Ct. At 409. And we reaffirmed this principle recently in Bank of Nova Scotia, where we held that "the mere fact that evidence itself is unreliable is not sufficient to require a dismissal of the indictment." and that "a challenge to the reliability or competence of the evidence presented to the grand jury" will not be heard. 487 US, at 261, 108 S.Ct. At 2377. It would make little sense, we think, to abstain from reviewing the evidentiary support for the grand jury's judgment while scrutinizing the sufficiency of the prosecutor's presentation. A complaint about the quality or adequacy of the evidence can always be recast as a complaint that the prosecutors presentation was "incomplete" or "misleading." Our words in Costello bear repeating" Review of facially valid indictments on such grounds "would run counter to the whole history of the grand jury institution, and neither justice nor the concept of a fair trial requires it." 350 US at 364, 76 S.Ct. At 409.

REBUTTAL #9 Again, the aforesaid would deny government by consent and place WE the PEOPLE in subjection to our servant prosecutor. Quoting US v Williams Recognizing this tradition of independence, we have said that the Fifth Amendment's "constitutional guarantee presupposes an investigative body 'acting independently of either prosecuting attorney or judge' . . . ." Id., at 16, 93 S.Ct. At 773 (quoting Stirone, supra, 361, US, at 218, 80 S.Ct., at 273).

REBUTTAL #10. The aforesaid would place the government above reproach whereby they could prevent indictments against their own and again, would deny government by consent and place WE the PEOPLE in subjection to our servant prosecutor. Quoting US v Williams "Given the grand jury's operational separateness from its constituting court, it should come as no surprise that we have been

reluctant to invoke the judicial supervisory power as a basis for prescribing modes of grand jury procedure. Over the years, we have received many requests to exercise supervision over the grand jury's evidence-taking process, but we have refused them all, including some more appealing than the one presented today. In Calandra v United States, supra, a grand jury witness faced questions that were allegedly based upon physical evidence the Government had obtained through a violation of the Fourth Amendment; we reject the proposal that the exclusionary rule be extended to grand jury proceedings, because of "the potential injury to the historic role and functions of the grand jury" 414 US at 349, 94 S.Ct. At 620. Costello v United States, 350 US 359, 76 S.Ct. 406, 100 L.Ed. 397 (1956), we decline to enforce the hearsay rule in grand jury proceedings, since that "would run counter to the whole history of the grand jury institution, in which laymen conduct their inquiries unfettered by technical rules." Id., at 364, 76 S.Ct., at 409."

REBUTTAL #11 Magna Carta Paragraph 52 makes it clear that a grand jury is made up of 25 people not 23. . . .if a dispute arise over this, then let it be decided by the five and twenty jurors of whom mention is made below in the clause for securing the peace.

LYSANDER SPOONER (An Essay on the Trial by Jury, 1852): "there can be no legal right to resist the oppressions of the government, unless there be some legal tribunal, other than the government, and wholly independent of, and above, the government, to judge between the government and those who resist its oppressions..."

LYSANDER SPOONER (An Essay on the Trial by Jury, 1852): "The authority to judge what are the powers of the government, and what are the liberties of the people, must necessarily be vested in one or the other of the parties themselves—the government, or the people; because there is no third party to whom it can be entrusted. If the authority be vested in the government, the government is absolute, and the people have no liberties except such as the government sees fit to indulge them with."

Marston's, Inc. v. Strand, 560 P.2d 778, 114 Ariz. 260): "Grand jury is an investigative body acting independently of either prosecutor or judge whose mission is to bring to trial those who may be guilty and clear the innocent."

"Although the grand jury normally operates, of course, in the courthouse and under judicial auspices, its institutional relationship with the judicial branch has traditionally been, so to speak, at arm's length." United States v Calandra, 414 US 338, 343, 94 S.Ct. 613, 617, 38 L.Ed.2d 561(1974); Fed.Rule Crim.Proc. 6(a).

CONCLUSION

WE the PEOPLE have the unalienable right to consent, or not to consent, as to the government's accusations against the People. And if indicted WE the PEOPLE have the unalienable right to decide the law, the facts and the conclusion of the matter.

All officers of the court Magistrates, Judges, Prosecutors, Appointed Counsels, United States Attorneys, Sheriffs, United States Marshalls and clerks; and Legislators' of statutes are employed by the government and/or are members of the BAR which teaches their members to be anti-constitutional and anti-common law, and thereby subversive. They are trained to place the letter of legislative law above the essence of common law, that being justice and mercy.

To allow our servants to control the jury would breed "absolute" government corruption and control which this paper and present judiciary conditions conclusively proves. Therefore, it is the inalienable right of WE the PEOPLE to provide for the administration of the Grand and Petit Juries. The first recorded grand jury was established by the People through the Magna Carta, whereas the grand jury assembled itself and brought into subjection the tyrant king back under the will of the People; and today, now, so do WE the PEOPLE.

RELIEF & DAMAGES INFLICTED

The damages to me are extreme but not uncommon. They have damaged my reputation, caused me a job loss and with scheduling during my working hours with out my consultation they are trying to get me fired from my present position. I have a right to food, clothing and shelter of which they have tried to undermine since I have moved to this county. I had a $17.00 hour position with the post office that I was hired for but the offer was rescinded because of this on my record on a background search. This was a full time position. Approx $35,000 a year.

Here is what I AM SEEKING… damages for emotional, time spent and damage to my income.

It is damaging to have your life ruled by court dates once a month and for them to play games with you just to get you to submit. I will not submit but that does not mean it does not damage me emotionally.

I have laid out a fee schedule for appearing and paperwork.

1. travel expenses, $20 per day (14) ($280)
2. time off work $250.00 per day (4) ($1000)
3. time to prepare paperwork $2500 per hour, (12 hours, 13 hours, 1 hour, 1 hour) ($67,500)
4. fee for appearing $2500 per hour min 1 hour. (12) ($30,000)

grand total that the courts owe me for my appearing under duress, **$98,780**

The Civil RICO act, gets triple the amount of any damages.

1. Wages. 5 years at $35,000, it will damage me for a minimum of 5 years maybe more. ($175,000)

2. fee schedule that has not been paid, ($98,780)

3. Emotional and social damages. Defamation of character. ($100,000 per each defendant listed x3=**$300,000**)

number 1 and number 2 are to be split between the judges, Minnehaha county, the Minnehaha public defenders office and the incorporated state of South Dakota. ($273,780 X3 = **$821,340**) (164,268 each)

I will be asking for and requesting the IRS returns and financial & banking statements of all the defendants to determine the payoffs to and from offices and judges. For the last 3 years

Judge Patrick Schroeder, Judge Eric Johnson, Aaron McGowan, Marty Jackley and Lisa Capellupo

Also finanical records and bank statements for all of these incorporated offices. For the last 3 years.

MINNEHAHA COUNTY INC
MINNEHAHA STATES ATTORNEYS OFFICE,
STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA INC.
ATTORNEY GENERALS OFFICE
MINNEHAHA PUBLIC DEFENDERS OFFICE

MONEY DAMAGES

A.) Do you claim either actual or punitive monetary damages for the acts alleged in this complaint? Answer : YES

B.) If answer to A, is YES , state below the amount claimed and the reasons you are entitled to them.

Answer: 1. Lost Wages and damages to job prospects outlined previously. And damage to my reputation and a living wage. ($175,000) 2. fee schedule that has not been paid, ($98,780) 3. Emotional and social damages. Defamation of character. ($100,000 per each defendant listed x3=**$300,000**)

number 1 and number 2 are to be split between the judges, Minnehaha county, the Minnehaha public defenders office and the incorporated state of South Dakota. ($273,780 X3 = **$821,340**) (164,268 each)

Do you maintain that the wrongs alleged in the complaint are continuing to occur at the present time?

Answer : YES

Are you requesting a Jury Trial?

Answer : YES

Please look at
Attachment A, Every document I could get on my case at the Minnehaha County Courthouse.

Attachment B, a background check that got my offer rescinded from the Post Office.

Attachment C, Reciepts for Certified copies of Case MAG17-5125 and court trial schedule showing the judges and dates of this case.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the forgoing is true and correct,

Signed this day 10 of April, 20 18

Pro-Se Rene Meyer Rene D. Meyer

(signed in Red Ink)